

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-28 are pending, in which claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 20, 22 and 27 are amended. Care was exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter.

The Office Action mailed March 30, 2005 rejected claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-18 and 22-25 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Dixon* (US 6,023,242) in view of *Adiwoso et al.* (US 5,963,862), claims 5, 12, 19 and 26 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Dixon* in view of *Adiwoso et al.* and in further view of *Haugli et al.* (US 6,522,638), and claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27 and 28 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Dixon* in view of *Adiwoso et al.* and in further view of *Pond* (US 5,860,056).

In the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 22. Independent claims 1 and 22, as amended, recite "wherein the beacon satellite serves as a temporary default satellite during the commissioning." Independent claims 8 and 15 now recite "the beacon satellite serves as a temporary default satellite during the auto-commissioning." These features are fully supported by the Specification; for example, within paragraph [190].

By contrast, the primary reference of *Dixon* merely discloses, in general terms, that an Earth station is configured as a mobile station which may be configured to communicate with either non-geostationary satellites or geostationary satellites (col. 6; 44-47). There is no use of a "beacon" satellite, much less, "wherein the beacon satellite serves as a temporary default satellite during the commissioning."

The addition of *Adiwoso et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of *Dixon*. *Adiwoso et al.* is applied for a teaching of "each satellite transponder is capable of being allocated to an uplink beam and a downlink beam." *Adiwoso et al.* discloses (col. 2: 39-63) a telecommunication system that integrates fixed and mobile satellite-based services. Integration of fixed and mobile services is achieved by a gateway architecture that includes one or more antennas controlled by a gateway station controller. The gateway station controller is coupled to a mobile switching center, which, in turn, is coupled to a terrestrial network. The gateway station controller provides control signals which drive the antennas to route a call to the number through the satellites. The call is routed to either the user terminal or the mobile cellular telephone of the user.

Additionally, the secondary reference of *Haugli et al.* is likewise lacking in any disclosure of the claimed feature of "wherein the beacon satellite serves as a temporary default satellite during the commissioning." The Office Action, on page 7, cites *Haugli et al.* for a supposed teaching of a "satellite network is used to allow a user at a mobile terminal to browse information on the Web via the Packet Processing and Network Operations Centre."

Further, *Pond* is silent with respect to "wherein the beacon satellite serves as a temporary default satellite during the commissioning." *Pond* is applied for a supposed teaching of "antenna parameters comprise frequency of the satellite, the position of the satellite in [sic] specified in longitude, the polarity of the satellite and the polarization offset" (Office Action, page 8).

Even assuming the applied references were properly combined based on some teaching or suggestion in the references, and assuming the modifications proposed in the Office Action were justified by additional teachings or suggestions found in the references, even the combination does not render the claimed invention obvious. Specifically, none the references taken alone, or in combination, teaches or suggests "wherein the beacon satellite serves as a temporary default satellite during the commissioning." Therefore, Applicants submit that the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 are not satisfied, and respectfully urge the withdrawal of the obviousness rejections.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21 and 23-28, which depend correspondingly from claims 1, 8, 15 and 22, are allowable at least for the reasons proffered for the allowability of claims 1, 8, 15 and 22.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (301) 601-7252 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig L. Plastrik
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,254

6-29-05